REMARKS

A. PATENTABILITY OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 27-29, 31-37, 39-42 and 44-47 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,313,652 to Rozenstrauch et al in view of U.S. Publication 2002/0187784 to Tigerstedt et al. Claims 30, 38 and 43 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,313,652 to Rozenstrauch et al in view of U.S. Publication 2002/0187784 to Tigerstedt et al, further in view of 3GPP Tech. Spec. 25.215 v.3.1.0. All prior art rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

B. SELECTED COMMENTS CONCERNING THE DISCLOSURE

Applicants have recognized that a handover decision based on a single parameter e.g. RSCP or Ec/No is less than ideal in a handover situation from GSM to WCDMA. According to the prior art, the decisions in the respective systems are based on different parameters, thus leaving a large room for error in selecting an optimal cell when handover is deemed necessary.

The claimed technology pertains to telecommunications, and particularly to handover or change of cell for a wireless user terminal. Such a handover can be, for example, a handover between a first radio access technology (RAT) (e.g., a GSM cell) and second radio access technology (RAT) utilizing UTRAN (a WCDMA cell).

In conjunction with applicants handover, a first and a second parameter relating to quality and signal strength (e.g. Ec/No and RSCP) are *measured and reported simultaneously* for each UTRAN cell in the network. The two parameters (e.g. first and second) are measured and reported to a base station controller. Handover to a new cell is initiated and completed based on *both* of the reported parameters. Thus, Applicants' handover is *not performed or decided upon until both parameters have been reported and taken into consideration*. In order to further optimize the reporting format, *the values of*

the two measured parameters are included in a same field in a standardized Measurement Report message and are reported simultaneously according to one of a respective plurality of value ranges.

C. PATENTABILITY OF THE CLAIMS

US Patent 5,313,652 to Rozenstrauch discloses a method of collapsing a communication path among at least two communication units, in a trunked communication system, to reduce the number of sites normally required to provide a communication. The Rozenstrauch method includes determining whether the communication units are currently being serviced by different sites, and then determining whether they can be serviced by a common site. When the communication units are serviceable by a common site, the call might be established through the common site, resulting in a reduced number of sites required to complete a call.

US Patent Publication 2002/0187784 to Tigerstedt et al discloses a method of triggering inter-frequency or inter-system handover between two WCDMA carriers or a WCDMA carrier and a GSM carrier. Six triggering conditions are used to initiate the search for an alternative network connection by starting the handover measurements.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the 35 USC §103(a) prior art rejections for at least the following reasons.

Rozenstrauch fails to disclose, e.g., initiating handover from a first radio access network utilizing a first radio access technology to one of a plurality of cells in a second radio access network utilizing WCDMA. Specifically, Rozenstrauch fails to disclose initiating handover specifically based on all of (i.e. both) the reported parameters. Instead Rozenstrauch discloses that the quality metrics are sent to a primary controller and its data is used in determining whether the communication unit can be redirected or not. Further, Rozenstrauch fails to disclose (1) reporting the first parameter according to one

of a limited range of values, and (2) the second parameter in the same field in a Measurement Report Message using a limited value range such that each first parameter value is reported together with one of a plurality of possible limited value ranges of the second parameter.

The skilled person with knowledge of Rozenstrauch finds no guidance towards the present invention in Tigerstedt and would not be motivated to turn to Tigerstedt. Specifically, Tigerstedt fails to disclose initiating handover from a first radio access network utilizing a first radio access technology to a second radio access network utilizing WCDMA based on two parameters reported wherein a first parameter is reported according to one of a limited range of values, and the second parameter is reported in the same field in a Measurement Report Message using a limited value range such that each first parameter value is reported together with one of a plurality of possible limited value ranges of the second parameter.

Although Tigerstedt discloses triggering handover if a triggering parameter indicative of a measured power (e.g. uplink mobile transmission power) or some other triggering parameter has exceeded a threshold value longer over a predetermined period of time, Tigerstedt fails to disclose how triggering parameter values are reported from a user equipment to a node in the network. In particular, D2 fails to disclose reporting two triggering parameters in a same field. Instead, D2 concerns obtaining indications of one triggering parameter and using that triggering parameter to initiate signal strength and/or signal quality measurements to initiate handover. The triggering parameters comprise indications about, for example, uplink or downlink transmission power, uplink SIR, radio between received signal power to received signal strength indicator. An obtained parameter is compared to a reference value during a predetermined period of time. There is no indication in D2 concerning reporting measurements or triggering parameters in pairs by reporting one parameter according to one of a limited range of values together with one of a plurality of limited value ranges for the second parameter.

Consequently, the independent claims are patentable over the improperly alleged combination of Rozenstrauch and Tigerstedt.

In view of the foregoing and other considerations, Applicants submit that the prior art rejections are ineffective for denying patentability of the pending claims and should be withdrawn. Applicants submit that various dependent claims have separate patentable merit, but in view of the deficiencies of the instant prior art rejections such separate patentable merit need not be elaborated at this time, although future right to do so is reserved.

D. **MISCELLANEOUS**

In view of the foregoing and other considerations, all claims are deemed in condition for allowance. A formal indication of allowability is earnestly ted.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the undersigned's deposit account #14-1140 in whatever amount is necessary for entry of these papers and the continued pendency of the captioned application.

Should the Examiner feel that an interview with the undersigned would facilitate allowance of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /H. Warren Burnam, Jr.
H. Warren Burnam, Jr.
Reg. No. 29,366

HWB:lsh
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100